



INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SERVICES

Quarterly Report
to
The Indiana State Budget Committee
and
The Indiana Legislative Council

Submitted by:
James W. Payne, Director
For the quarter ended
December 31, 2005



Protecting our children, families and future

Pursuant to Section 95, IC 31-33-1.5 Section 5, once every three months, the Department of Child Services is required to submit a report to the budget committee and the legislative council that provides data and statistical information regarding caseloads of child protection workers. This report details:

1. The department's progress in recruiting, training and retaining caseworkers
2. The methodology used to compute caseloads for each child protection worker
3. The statewide average caseloads for child protection caseworkers and whether they exceed the standards established by the department
4. A written plan that indicates steps that are being taken to reduce caseloads if the report indicates that average caseloads exceed caseload standards
5. Recommendations for best management practices and resources required to achieve effective and efficient delivery of child protection services

1. Recruitment, Training and Retention of Family Case Managers

In order to reach the goal of adding 200 new family case managers (FCMs) in SFY 2006, DCS looked at personnel and training needs along with capacity. Quickly, it was determined that DCS needed a hiring manager dedicated to this undertaking, in addition to personnel resources provided by FSSA. To that end, DCS identified funds internally and hired a Human Resources Manager to fill that role. A timeline was established to outline the steps beginning with identifying counties in need of staff and ending with the first day of work. The process takes a minimum of eight weeks and requires interviewing a minimum of seven applicants for each position available. Recruiting and interviewing is done locally; the process is managed by Central Office and is detailed in Exhibit 1.

DCS determined the optimum hiring schedule, and the first class began July 5, 2005. In every new bi-weekly class, slots were created for ten new hires and five vacancy-fills. This schedule was based on training facility capacity and capability.

DCS training staff and consultants redesigned the training delivery system into an intensive twelve-week course. Four of the twelve weeks take place in Indianapolis and the other eight are set in one of the regional training centers. The location of the regional training class depends on the geographic location of the employees hired in the group. In other words, training is provided as close to employees' home base as possible.

As of December 31, 2005, the Department of Child Services (DCS) hired 103 new family case managers (FCMs) or 51.5% of the goal of 200. Of those, 79 have already completed the three-month intensive training class and are now in county offices, beginning to carry cases. The remaining 24 (for a total of 103) will complete training by March 8, 2006.



Protecting our children, families and future

Within six months of their start dates, FCMs should carry full caseloads. Of the 103 newly hired, 4 resigned and one was terminated; the retention rate is 95% among new hires.

Agency wide, the total number of filled FCM positions increased by 83, from 803 to 886. This is in spite of the number of new hires discussed above and is due to the number of resignations and terminations increasing faster than vacancies could be filled. Seventy-eight vacancies were created by termination, resignation or transfer; sixty three vacancies were filled. The chart below reflects these numbers for the first six months of SFY 2006.

Type of position	Additions	Number lost	Net gain
New	103	5	98
Existing	63	78	(15)
TOTAL	166	83	83

Exhibit 2 details the actual hiring status for each class, or cohort, as DCS refers to them.

2. Caseload data

On a monthly basis, DCS gathers information to determine which counties are in the greatest need of staff. The information is gathered from Indiana's automated child welfare reporting system (ICWIS) and from local county directors. ICWIS provides information on the number of new investigations opened each month and the number of children served by the county. County directors confirm staffing levels, including total staff, staff in training, and staff unavailable for any reason. This information is loaded into a spreadsheet.

The 12/17 standard represents that of the Child Welfare League of America and is the requirement established by legislation that DCS must meet by July 1, 2008, which is 12 new investigations per month or 17 on-going children.

Exhibit 3 shows the number needed to reach 12 investigations OR 17 on-going children. Please note that these numbers are cyclical and vary from month to month.

The issue of caseload data must include the current national discussion regarding caseload definitions. As currently set out in statute, DCS must comply with standards that include 12 new investigations per month or 17 ongoing children being supervised by a case manager at any one time. Those definitions are clear in large to medium counties where the caseloads allow those divisions to be clearly defined. In smaller counties,



Protecting our children, families and future

however, the issue of mixed caseloads is more difficult to determine, in large part because ongoing caseloads of 17 are fairly static while investigation caseloads are fluid, changing day to day, week to week. We will continue to work with national leaders and organizations as these discussions bring more mathematical certainty to those designations.

Additionally, there is tremendous national dialogue on the issue of defining caseload versus workload. The distinction has to do with the number of cases a casework manager will have versus the work necessary to adequately and appropriately provide that work – leading to safety, permanency, and well-being for children and families. This becomes particularly more difficult as we add to or significantly change the workload requirements for case managers either by statute or by policy. One example of this is the recent requirement for more extensive criminal background checks, specifically referring to the time and complexity involved for a case manager to obtain those background checks.

Finally, the issue of caseload reduction will be impacted greatly as DCS implements its philosophy of practice in safety for children remaining at home, implementing a practice of engaging families through team participation, and more accurate assessment of initial care and ongoing treatment. Over time, it is anticipated that these matters will be effective in reducing the degree and intensity of involvement and various stages through the process.

3. Percentage of caseloads in compliance with standards.

Analysis of Exhibit 3 indicates that, as of December 31, 2005, only 21.7% meet the 12/17 standard.

It should be noted that these are averages. It is possible that any individual FCM will be carrying a caseload in excess of benchmark. However, as additional FCMs are hired and trained, and existing FCMs are retained on the job, averages should better reflect actuals. Moreover, as additional FCMs are hired, based on allowances set in the biennium budget, caseloads should decline and approach acceptable levels.

4. Plans to reduce caseloads

DCS will continue with the plan to hire 200 case managers per year for FY 2006 and FY 2007 as funded by the General Assembly. Monthly, the caseload averages will be calculated and analyzed. For the next biennium, the number of additional case managers



Protecting our children, families and future

needed to bring DCS into compliance with caseloads as defined by state law will be calculated and submitted in the budget request.

5. Effective and Efficient Delivery of Child Protection Services

Although many positive steps occurred to facilitate the effective and professional delivery of child protection services, many challenges remain. They include:

- Continuation of hiring new FCMs to reach legislated caseloads
- Sufficient supervision to ensure proper support of FCMs
- Sufficient support staff for supervisors and FCMs in local offices
- Sufficient legal staff to support legal needs of local offices
- Sufficient administrative staff to support county operations
- Sufficient central office staff to support financial, policy, training, programs, and quality assurance

DCS is in the process of assessing current resources and documenting needs. Many of these areas are significantly under-staffed today. As these needs are identified, this report will be updated.



Protecting our children, families and future

Cohort Hiring Timeline

	Cohort #	Identify County	Training Location chosen	Post	Recruit	Evaluate Application	Schedule Interview	Interview #1	Background Check	Position Offered	Position Accepted	Packet	Hotel Arrangements	Start Date
Time Frame		Day One	Day One	Day 7	Day 7	Day 16	Day 20	Day 28	Day 29	Day 35	Day 42	Day 46	Day 52	Day 56
Due Dates														
	1	10-May-05	Marion County	17-May-05	17-May-05	26-May-05	30-May-05	31-May-05	8-Jun-05	14-Jun-05	21-Jun-05	25-Jun-05	1-Jul-05	5-Jul-05
	2	23-May-05	Marion County	30-May-05	30-May-05	8-Jun-05	12-Jun-05	13-Jun-05	21-Jun-05	27-Jun-05	4-Jul-05	8-Jul-05	14-Jul-05	18-Jul-05
	3	6-Jun-05	Marion County	13-Jun-05	13-Jun-05	22-Jun-05	26-Jun-05	27-Jun-05	5-Jul-05	11-Jul-05	18-Jul-05	22-Jul-05	28-Jul-05	1-Aug-05
	4	20-Jun-05	VOID	27-Jun-05	27-Jun-05	6-Jul-05	10-Jul-05	11-Jul-05	19-Jul-05	25-Jul-05	1-Aug-05	5-Aug-05	11-Aug-05	15-Aug-05
	5	12-Jul-05	Marion County	19-Jul-05	19-Jul-05	28-Jul-05	1-Aug-05	2-Aug-05	10-Aug-05	16-Aug-05	23-Aug-05	27-Aug-05	2-Sep-05	6-Sep-05
	6	22-Jul-05	Fort Wayne	29-Jul-05	29-Jul-05	7-Aug-05	11-Aug-05	12-Aug-05	20-Aug-05	26-Aug-05	2-Sep-05	6-Sep-05	12-Sep-05	16-Sep-05
	7	8-Aug-05	Scottsburg	15-Aug-05	15-Aug-05	24-Aug-05	28-Aug-05	29-Aug-05	6-Sep-05	12-Sep-05	19-Sep-05	23-Sep-05	29-Sep-05	3-Oct-05
	8	22-Aug-05	Vincennes	29-Aug-05	29-Aug-05	7-Sep-05	11-Sep-05	12-Sep-05	20-Sep-05	26-Sep-05	3-Oct-05	7-Oct-05	13-Oct-05	17-Oct-05
	9	19-Sep-05	Indianapolis	26-Sep-05	26-Sep-05	5-Oct-05	9-Oct-05	10-Oct-05	18-Oct-05	24-Oct-05	31-Oct-05	4-Nov-05	10-Nov-05	14-Nov-05
	10	3-Oct-05	Michigan City	10-Oct-05	10-Oct-05	19-Oct-05	23-Oct-05	24-Oct-05	1-Nov-05	7-Nov-05	14-Nov-05	18-Nov-05	24-Nov-05	28-Nov-05
	11	17-Oct-05	Indianapolis	24-Oct-05	24-Oct-05	2-Nov-05	6-Nov-05	7-Nov-05	15-Nov-05	21-Nov-05	28-Nov-05	2-Dec-05	8-Dec-05	12-Dec-05
	12	14-Nov-05	Scottsburg	21-Nov-05	21-Nov-05	30-Nov-05	4-Dec-05	5-Dec-05	13-Dec-05	19-Dec-05	26-Dec-05	30-Dec-05	5-Jan-06	9-Jan-06
	13	28-Nov-05	Indianapolis	5-Dec-05	5-Dec-05	14-Dec-05	18-Dec-05	19-Dec-05	27-Dec-05	2-Jan-06	9-Jan-06	13-Jan-06	19-Jan-06	23-Jan-06
	14	12-Dec-05	Indianapolis	19-Dec-05	19-Dec-05	28-Dec-05	1-Jan-06	2-Jan-06	10-Jan-06	16-Jan-06	23-Jan-06	27-Jan-06	2-Feb-06	6-Feb-06
	15	26-Dec-05	Indianapolis	2-Jan-06	2-Jan-06	11-Jan-06	15-Jan-06	16-Jan-06	24-Jan-06	30-Jan-06	6-Feb-06	10-Feb-06	16-Feb-06	20-Feb-06
	16	9-Jan-06	Michigan City	16-Jan-06	16-Jan-06	25-Jan-06	29-Jan-06	30-Jan-06	7-Feb-06	13-Feb-06	20-Feb-06	24-Feb-06	2-Mar-06	6-Mar-06
	17	23-Jan-06	Indianapolis	30-Jan-06	30-Jan-06	8-Feb-06	12-Feb-06	13-Feb-06	21-Feb-06	27-Feb-06	6-Mar-06	10-Mar-06	16-Mar-06	20-Mar-06
	18	6-Feb-06		13-Feb-06	13-Feb-06	22-Feb-06	26-Feb-06	27-Feb-06	7-Mar-06	13-Mar-06	20-Mar-06	24-Mar-06	30-Mar-06	3-Apr-06
	19	20-Jan-06		27-Jan-06	27-Jan-06	5-Feb-06	9-Feb-06	10-Feb-06	18-Feb-06	24-Feb-06	3-Mar-06	7-Mar-06	13-Mar-06	17-Mar-06
	20	6-Mar-06		13-Mar-06	13-Mar-06	22-Mar-06	26-Mar-06	27-Mar-06	4-Apr-06	10-Apr-06	17-Apr-06	21-Apr-06	27-Apr-06	1-May-06
	21	20-Mar-06		27-Mar-06	27-Mar-06	5-Apr-06	9-Apr-06	10-Apr-06	18-Apr-06	24-Apr-06	1-May-06	5-May-06	11-May-06	15-May-06
	22	10-Apr-06		17-Apr-06	17-Apr-06	26-Apr-06	30-Apr-06	1-May-06	9-May-06	15-May-06	22-May-06	26-May-06	1-Jun-06	5-Jun-06
	23	24-Apr-06		1-May-06	1-May-06	10-May-06	14-May-06	15-May-06	23-May-06	29-May-06	5-Jun-06	9-Jun-06	15-Jun-06	19-Jun-06
	24													
	25													

NOTE: This report delineates the steps and the timeline for the hiring process

Cohort Hiring Report

NOTE: This report tracks the positions to be hired by cohort, or training group. It shows the number of both new and vacant positions to be filled and the actual number hired by county.

Cohort #1 County Names Marion County Start Date 7/5/05	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 7-5-05	
Tippecanoe		1		1	1	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	12
Montgomery		1		1	1	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	4
Decatur		1		1	1		
Marion	12	1	12	1	13		
Cohort #2 County Names Marion County Start Date 7/18/05	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 7-18-05	
Tippecanoe		1		1	1	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	22
Starke	1		1		1	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	10
Madison		1		1	1		
Shelby		1		1	1		
Marion	9	3	9	3	12		
Cohort #3 County Names Marion County Start Date 8/1/05	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 8-1-05	
Fulton	1		1		1	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	29
Noble	1		1		1	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	15
Tippecanoe	2		2		2		
Montgomery	1		1		1		
Marion		2		2	2		
Madison		1		1	1		
Henry	1	1	1	1	2		
Sullivan		1		1	1		
Scott	1		1		1		

Cohort Hiring Report

Cohort #4 County Names	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired
Start Date 8/15/05					
Jennings					
Vigo					
Harrison					
Gibson					
Crawford					
Morgan					
Jackson					
Johnson					
Bartholomew					
Rush					
Scott					
Perry					
Fayette					

VOID

Cohort #5 County Names	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 9-6-05	
Marion County							
Start Date 9/6/05							
Marion		2		2	2	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	40
Delaware	1		1		1	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	21
Morgan		1		1	1		
Tippecanoe	1		1		1		
Johnson	1		1		1		
Montgomery	1		1		1		
Rush	1		1		1		
Fayette		1		1	1		
Benton		1		1	1		
Grant		1		1	1		
Boone	2		2		2		
Miami	1		1		1		
Shelby	1		1		1		
Clinton	1		1		1		
Vigo	1		1		1		

Cohort Hiring Report

Cohort #6 County Names Fort Wayne Start Date 9/19/05	Proposed		Actual Number		Actual	Running Totals as of 9-19-05	
	New Hires	Vacancy Hires	New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Total Hired		
Steuben	1		1		1	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	52
Wabash	1	1	1	1	2	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	27
St. Joe	3		3		3		
Wells	1		1		1		
Huntington	1		1		1		
Allen	1	3	1	3	4		
Elkhart		1		1	1		
Delaware	1		1		1		
Miami	1		1		1		
Marshall	1		1		1		
Fulton		1		1	1		
Noble	1		1		1		
Cohort #7 County Names SouthEast - Scottsburg Start Date 10/03/05	Proposed		Actual Number		Actual	Running Totals as of 10-3-05	
	New Hires	Vacancy Hires	New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Total Hired		
Jennings	2	1	2	1	3	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	65
Harrison	1		1		1	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	28
Crawford	1		1		1		
Dearborn	1		1		1		
Perry	1		1		1		
Jackson	1		1		1		
Bartholomew	2		2		2		
Orange	1		1		1		
Jefferson	1		1		1		
Scott	1		1		1		
Morgan	1		1		1		

Cohort Hiring Report

Cohort #8 County Names Vincennes Start Date 10/17/05	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 10-17-05	
Vermillion	1		1		1	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	79
Vanderburgh	2	2	2	2	4	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	33
Vigo	3	1	3	1	4		
Gibson	2	1	2	1	3		
Monroe	1		1		1		
Lawrence	2		2		2		
Sullivan	1		1		1		
Putnam	1		1		1		
Morgan		1		1	1		
Knox	1		1		1		
Cohort #9 County Names Indianapolis Start Date 11/14/05	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 11-14-05	
Delaware	1		1		1	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	84
Johnson	2		2		2	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	43
Putnam		1		1	1		
Madison	1		1		1		
Tippecanoe		2		2	2		
Montgomery		1		1	1		
Marion		4		4	4		
Owen		1		1	1		
Shelby		1		1	1		
Fulton	1		1		1		

Cohort Hiring Report

Cohort #10 County Names Michigan City Start Date 11/28/05	Proposed		Actual Number		Actual	Running Totals as of 11-28-05	
	New Hires	Vacancy Hires	New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Total Hired		
Steuben	3		3		3	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	94
LaPorte	2	1	2	1	3	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	52
Porter	1	1	1	1	2		
Cass	1	1	1	1	2		
DeKalb	2		2		2		
Lake		3		3	3		
St. Joseph	1	1	1	1	2		
Elkhart		1		1	1		
Miami		1		1	1		
Cohort #11 County Names Indianapolis Start Date 12/12/05	Proposed		Actual Number		Actual	Running Totals as of 12-12-05	
	New Hires	Vacancy Hires	New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Total Hired		
Marion		5		5	5	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	103
Morgan	2		2		2	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	64
Hamilton		2	1	1	2		
Madison	2		2		2		
Tippecanoe	1	2	1	2	3		
Delaware	1	1	1	1	2		
Hendricks	1	1	1	1	2		
Henry		1		1	1		
Monroe		1		1	1		

Cohort Hiring Report

Cohort #12 County Names Scottsburg Start Date 1/9/06	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 1-9-06	
Clark	2.5	5	3	5	7.5	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	115
Floyd	1	1	1	1	2	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	70
Harrison	3		3		3		
Scott	3		3		3		
Jennings	1		1		1		
Jackson	1		1		1		
Cohort #13 County Names Indianapolis Start Date 1/23/06	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 1-23-06	
Hendricks	1		1		1	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	123
Montgomery	5		5		5	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	80
Morgan	1		1		1		
Putnam	1	2	1	2	3		
Marion		8		8	8		
Cohort #14 County Names Indianapolis Start Date 2/6/06	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 2-6-06	
Montgomery	1		1		1	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	137
Boone	1		1		1	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	84
Hendricks	1		1		1		
Putnam	1		1		1		
Marion	10	4	10	4	14		

Cohort Hiring Report

Cohort #15 County Names Indianapolis Start Date 2/20/06	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 2-20-06	
Marion	15		15		15	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	155
Tippecanoe	3		3		3	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	85
Rush		1		1	1		
Cohort #16 County Names Michigan City Start Date 3/6/06	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 3-6-06	
Lake		7	1	6	7	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	163
Porter	2	3	1	3	4	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	95
Fountain		2	1	1	2		
St. Joseph	2		2		2		
Benton	1		1		1		
Newton		1	1		1		
Starke		1	1		1		
Cohort #17 County Names Marion Start Date 3/20/06	Proposed New Hires	Vacancy Hires	Actual New Hires	Number Vacancy Hires	Actual Total Hired	Running Totals as of 3-20-06	
Marion		7		7	7	Total New Hires since 7/5/05	174
Madison	3		3		3	Total Vacancies filled since 7/5/05	102
Fayette	2		2		2		
Tippecanoe	2		2		2		
Rush	2		2		2		
Hamilton	1		1		1		
Franklin	1		1		1		

Exhibit 3: December 2005 Caseload Ratios

Region	County Name	FCMs w/ caseload as of 1/1/06	Total Number of New Investigations	Total Number of Children (CHINS, SRA, IA)	Total Number of FCMs needed to reach average caseload of 12/17	Total percentage of FCMs needed to reach average caseload of 12/17
4	Adams	3	10	32	2.7	-10.61%
4	Allen	48	254	957	77.5	38.04%
14	Bartholomew	8	63	171	15.3	47.74%
5	Benton	1	14	20	2.3	57.38%
7	Blackford	2	11	13	1.7	-18.95%
9	Boone	5	27	72	6.5	22.90%
13	Brown	2	7	15	1.5	-36.45%
5	Carroll	2	5	10	1.0	-99.02%
6	Cass	3	16	64	5.1	41.15%
18	Clark	18	85	312	25.4	29.23%
8	Clay	3	12	38	3.2	7.27%
5	Clinton	6	31	63	6.3	4.60%
17	Crawford	4	12	60	4.5	11.69%
17	Daviess	4	12	53	4.1	2.86%
15	Dearborn	5	26	78	6.8	25.98%
15	Decatur	4	24	32	3.9	-3.03%
4	DeKalb	5	38	86	8.2	39.21%
7	Delaware	23	78	423	31.4	26.71%
17	Dubois	3	14	63	4.9	38.43%
3	Elkhart	22	109	304	27.0	18.41%
12	Fayette	6	37	119	10.1	40.50%
18	Floyd	6	34	55	6.1	1.13%
5	Fountain	2	18	26	3.0	33.98%
12	Franklin	2	15	32	3.1	36.15%
6	Fulton	3	11	47	3.7	18.51%
16	Gibson	3	20	95	7.3	58.65%
7	Grant	11	43	189	14.7	25.18%
13	Greene	6	23	108	8.3	27.45%
11	Hamilton	4	46	56	7.1	43.88%
11	Hancock	3	17	43	3.9	23.98%
18	Harrison	4	17	91	6.8	40.91%
9	Hendricks	4	30	53	5.6	28.80%

Region	County Name	FCMs w/ caseload as of 1/1/06	Total Number of New Investigations	Total Number of Children (CHINS, SRA, IA)	Total Number of FCMs needed to reach average caseload of 12/17	Total percentage of FCMs needed to reach average caseload of 12/17
12	Henry	5	25	87	7.2	30.57%
6	Howard	10	69	117	12.6	20.84%
4	Huntington	3	32	56	6.0	49.67%
14	Jackson	8	33	121	9.9	18.93%
2	Jasper	3	12	28	2.6	-13.33%
7	Jay	2	15	26	2.8	28.04%
15	Jefferson	7	30	96	8.1	14.08%
14	Jennings	4	17	118	8.4	52.14%
14	Johnson	8	40	116	10.2	21.24%
16	Knox	5	27	77	6.8	26.25%
3	Kosciusko	5	35	50	5.9	14.64%
4	LaGrange	4	27	63	6.0	32.84%
1	Lake	98	216	2067	139.6	29.79%
2	LaPorte	13	81	156	15.9	18.37%
13	Lawrence	5	21	101	7.7	34.99%
11	Madison	16	93	306	25.8	37.86%
10	Marion	155	720	3397	259.8	40.34%
3	Marshall	6	15	130	8.9	32.56%
17	Martin	2	5	10	1.0	-99.02%
6	Miami	4	23	77	6.4	37.95%
13	Monroe	14	57	234	18.5	24.38%
9	Montgomery	6	21	153	10.8	44.19%
9	Morgan	4	13	108	7.4	46.21%
2	Newton	1	7	24	2.0	49.88%
4	Noble	4	30	65	6.3	36.74%
15	Ohio	1	5	10	1.0	0.49%
17	Orange	2	25	19	3.2	37.52%
13	Owen	4	17	39	3.7	-7.79%
8	Parke	2	7	9	1.1	-79.74%
17	Perry	3	18	64	5.3	43.02%
16	Pike	3	13	45	3.7	19.58%
2	Porter	10	41	335	23.1	56.75%
16	Posey	2	12	20	2.2	8.11%

Region	County Name	FCMs w/ caseload as of 1/1/06	Total Number of New Investigations	Total Number of Children (CHINS, SRA, IA)	Total Number of FCMs needed to reach average caseload of 12/17	Total percentage of FCMs needed to reach average caseload of 12/17
2	Pulaski	2	9	30	2.5	20.47%
9	Putnam	3	29	107	8.7	65.56%
7	Randolph	3	24	50	4.9	39.29%
15	Ripley	5	12	92	6.4	22.02%
12	Rush	3	13	46	3.8	20.83%
3	Saint Joe	31	121	631	47.2	34.32%
18	Scott	5	59	94	10.4	52.14%
14	Shelby	5	33	65	6.6	23.94%
17	Spencer	2	9	25	2.2	9.93%
2	Starke	3	15	56	4.5	33.98%
4	Steuben	5	27	109	8.7	42.28%
8	Sullivan	2	7	40	2.9	31.89%
15	Switzerland	2	2	39	2.5	18.73%
5	Tippecanoe	12	133	341	31.1	61.47%
11	Tipton	2	4	12	1.0	-92.45%
12	Union	2	3	38	2.5	19.53%
16	Vanderburgh	20	174	497	43.7	54.27%
8	Vermillion	2	12	34	3.0	33.33%
8	Vigo	14	51	311	22.5	37.90%
6	Wabash	4	14	42	3.6	-9.97%
5	Warren	1	2	15	1.0	4.67%
16	Warrick	6	18	89	6.7	10.92%
18	Washington	3	26	25	3.6	17.52%
12	Wayne	9	55	68	8.6	-4.85%
4	Wells	2	15	28	2.9	30.96%
5	White	2	11	23	2.3	11.88%
4	Whitley	2	5	20	1.6	-25.54%
	TOTAL	796	3844	15031	1204.5	